



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/529,231	01/31/2006	Peter Von Zimmermann	07781.0228	2141
22852 7590 08/09/2007 FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW, GARRETT & DUNNER LLP 901 NEW YORK AVENUE, NW WASHINGTON, DC 20001-4413				
			EXAMINER DUNHAM, JASON B	
			ART UNIT 3625	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 08/09/2007	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/529,231	<b>Applicant(s)</b> VON ZIMMERMANN ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> Jason B. Dunham	<b>Art Unit</b> 3625	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 29 May 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-10 and 16-27 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-10 and 16-27 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on May 29, 2007 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)   | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                       | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application                       |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Response to Amendment***

Applicant's drawings filed May 29, 2007 comprising replacement figure 4 and 5 are accepted. Applicant amended claims 1,10, and 24 and added claims 25-27 in the reply filed May 29, 2007 to the office action dated February 27, 2007. Claims 1-10 and 16-27 are pending.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

**Claims 1-10 and 16-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Flores (US 6,058,413) in view of Bandyh (US 2005/0177507).**

Referring to claim 1. The combination of Flores and Bandyh discloses a method for automatically filing documents relating to business transactions, using a computer system, the method comprising:

- Producing at least one input data record from data relating to a business transaction, the input data record having a structure specific to a class of business transactions and to one or more business applications (Flores: abstract, figures 4-6, and column 7, lines 44-61);

- Transforming the at least one input data record into an output data record designed for access by at least two business applications having different data requirements, wherein the output data record comprises a document having different data areas (Bandyach: abstract and paragraphs 28 and 121). The examiner notes that Bandyach discloses using identifiers to produce documents from the central system and converted to data that various trading partners can understand.
- Storing the output data record with an identification code (Flores: column 9, lines 18-29);
- Reading, by the at least two business applications, the different data areas in the output record depending on the data requirements of the at least two business applications by referring to the identification code (Bandyach: paragraphs 121 and 132).
- It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to have modified the method of Flores, to have included producing different output records for different business applications depending on their data requirements, as taught by Bandyach, in order to processing of transactions in a collaborative data set between different buying and selling entities (Bandyach: abstract).

Referring to claims 2-6. Claims 2-6 are rejected under the same rationale set forth above. The combination of Flores and Bandyach discloses a method of producing, transforming, transferring, and storing the records of claim 1 through the use of program

modules via an interface (Flores: figures 3-4 and column 7, lines 4-20 and column 8, lines 14-30).

Referring to claim 7. The combination of Flores and Bandyach further discloses a method wherein the output data record is stored on a transactional basis (Flores: column 9, lines 18-29).

Referring to claim 8. The combination of Flores and Bandyach further discloses a method wherein the output data record includes, for a plurality of business applications, a database structure having one or more tables (Flores: table 2).

Referring to claim 9. The combination of Flores and Bandyach further discloses a method wherein the output data record includes, for different journals in accounting, different data areas (Flores: column 3, line 47 – column 4, line 11). The examiner notes that applicant's specification defines journals as tabular summaries of posting records, separated for example into areas regarding costs, storage type and location, and customer. Flores discloses separate database for recording sales price and quantity ordered (Flores: column 9, lines 44-58).

Referring to claims 10 and 16-24. Claims 10 and 16-24 are rejected under the same rationale set forth above. The combination of Flores and Bandyach further discloses a system and medium according to claims 10 and 16-24 as evidenced by the cited portions in the rejection of the method claims and column 7, lines 4-20.

Referring to claim 25. The combination of Flores and Bandyach further discloses a method comprising adding data from a database application to the output data record (Flores: figure 7).

Referring to claims 26-27. Claims 26-27 are rejected under the same rationale set forth above.

***Response to Arguments***

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-10 and 16-27 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

***Conclusion***

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jason B. Dunham whose telephone number is 571-272-8109. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F, 8-5.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jeff Smith can be reached on 571-272-6763. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

JBD  
Patent Examiner  
8/3/07



JEFFREY A. SMITH  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3600